

**ETHICAL PRACTICE IN ANIMAL EXPERIMENTS, EXECUTION AND
OBSTACLES: A REVIEW**

Pallavi Singh Chauhan, Neha Sharma*, Rajesh Singh Tomar

Amity Institute of Biotechnology, Amity University Madhya Pradesh, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh,
India-474005

Corresponding Author's Email address: nsharma2@gwa.amity.edu

ABSTRACT

Increasing practice on animals in the research projects has paying attention towards the care, welfare and ethics associated to animal. The present review aims is highlighting the variety of aspects of animal care. Testing on animals is now been conducted in several research institutes. Animal testing have great practical consequentiality in finding a way for treating several diseases efficiently in humans as well, the reason behind this is very simple as human biology is very much similar to that of many other animals. Over 85% of animal research is regularly been conducted on mice, rats, fish, amphibians and reptiles. Rodents are the commonly used animal models, on which *in-vivo* studies are regularly been conducted because of their genetic, biological and behavioural homogeneous attributes with that of humans. Thus the present review objective is to provide an insight about appropriate route to be developed for animal experiment studies and their management.

Key Words: Animal care, Ethical Practices, Animal experiments

INTRODUCTION

Animals are used at a large scale in many research institutions as test subjects for testing the efficacy of different treatment modalities for acquisition the knowledge on human disease [1]. Animals (mice and rats) have various physiological and genetic resemblances, thus ultimately furthering medical science [2]. Wide range of rudimental science questions, from physiology, immunology, pharmacology, toxicology, pabulum, deportment and learning have been solved by using rats as a laboratory species [3].

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS_NSCTLs-2021

Vol. 2, Issue I, June 2021

ISSN: 2582-3310

With the end goal of Animals experiments, the Committee (CPCSEA) is shaped by means of the Act of the Indian Parliament, underneath the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1960 [4]. It is formed in 1964, restored in 1998, under chairpersonship of Maneka Gandhi. In the most current years, the CPCSEA had executed huge efforts for the better existence of the creatures in studies facilities crosswise over India [5]. This advisory group is made from individuals from established researchers, administrative professionals and creature activists [6]. The CPCSEA capacities with a wonderful system of volunteers who coordinate with the studies centres. [7]. With criterion for India: more than 665 labs are enlisted with the CPCSEA; Institutional Animal Ethics Committees (IAECs) are compulsory in every lab, which might be just enabled to suggest examine increase proposition that utilization rats, mice, guinea-pigs or rabbits; each undertaking that utilizations canines, ovines, bovines or non-human primates must be led if affirmed through the board of logical professionals constituted because of this; policies on lab creature care and practice had been defined and certified; a convention for the technology of immunobiologicals from horses has been planned and approved by the ultimate courtroom of India. The CPCSEA has been assessing on alternatives and operating out to offer alternatives in fundamental/administrative studies and guidance, almost about the commonplace field; the CPCSEA has restored and homed extra than three hundred canine, one hundred fifty horses, 2 hundred non-human primates and some dairy livestock, cat, winged creatures, mice and rabbits. The CPCSEA proactively prepares and directs logical and non-logical college on troubles of alternatives and lab creature welfare and it has battled lawful issues on lab creature care and make use of and have had choices that favoured picks and creature welfare [8-9].

It is important to develop a congruously standardized *in vivo* model for animal studies, while taking into concern animal welfare and the '3Rs' principle. Rat models have several benefits availability of compulsory materials, simple techniques, high reproducibility, and practicality for experiments with immensely colossal sample sizes [10].

Experiments on animal are a difficult issue. In 1997 Dr Jay Vacanti & team grew an auditory perceiver on the back of a mouse [11]. Incipient medicines have been developed by conducting animal experiments to develop and for measure the safety aspect of the products [12]. These

experiments are painful to animals also they reduces their quality of life [13]. If it is incorrect to cause animals to suffer, then experimenting on animals engenders intense moral uncertainties [14]. Animal experimenters should remember that during experimentation they should be very careful of this ethical issue and they should be as humane as possible [15]. They additionally allow that it's incorrect to utilize animals if alternative testing methods would create equivalent valid results [16].

In favour of animal experiments, suffering should be minimised and experiments should be utility based [17]. Animal experimentation is always unacceptable as it causes animals to suffer a lot. The animal experiments may engender benefits to humanity thus it is morally acceptable to harm few animals so as to provide moral justification [18].

“3 R’s” principles i.e. Reduction, Refinement, Replacement are three basic principles to be followed for reducing the impact of research on animals [19]. Reduction refers to reducing the quantity of animals used in experiments by making better experimental techniques, data analysis and exchanging research information [20]. Refinement refers to using less invasive techniques, proper medical care etc. Replacement refers to alternative experimental methods i.e. cell cultures in place of whole animals, utilizing computer models etc [21].

Scientists express their view that excluding animal experiments would mean either a terminus to testing incipient drugs or utilizing human beings for all safety tests [22]. Experiments on animals are not only done to show the safety aspect of drugs and its efficacy in human beings, instead, they are acclimated to avail decide whether to test a particular drug on people so as to eliminate drugs which are ineffective or too perilous to utilize on human beings [23]. Drug passing the animal test, are tested on a human group before large scale clinical tribulations [24]. The significance of animal testing is demonstrated by a William D H Carey (pharmacologist) in a letter to the British Medical Journal, where they have used 4 possible incipient drugs to treat HIV [25].

Suitable studies based on animal experiments can benefit human beings for its applicability [26]. There are numerous scientists who oppose or are not convinced for conducting these tests typically claimed by proponents of animal experimentation [27]. Animal experimentation has

been resulting in withholding of drugs from years [28]. Animal rights activists often update ethical rules on practitioners, who conventionally conduct cruelty during animal experiments, so as to part with any own moral standing [29]. The ethical status of the experimenters argues that the animal experimentation are morally right or wrong [30]. The general moral character of the experimenter is different.

The missing things of the experimenter in the ethical issues are ethical self-examination involving avoidance of animal suffering, which ultimately results in experimenters dehumanization along with ethical degradation [31]. Scientist like Gluck had offered their valuable opinions regarding animal experimentations [32].

The consumption of animals in research field should evolve out of a vigorous sense of ethical self-examination which involves a thorough estimation of one's own personal as well as scientific motives [33].

Animal experiments and rights

As it is wrong to break rights, it is important to understand that nature too has rights and if animal experiment breaks animal rights, then it is ethically wrong [34]. As animal rights should never be offended, animal experiments possible benefits to humanity are rude to the morality of the case [35]. As said by a philosopher, “there are some things that humanity will never be able to learn, so be it”. On the substratum of rights, deciding the morality of animal experimenting, people probably justify animal experiments on consequentiality grounds; by exhibiting that human benefits may involve animal suffering [36].

Justifying animal experiments

Experimenters favouring animal experiments leave an argument that the human benefit is larger than the harm done to animals [37]. As they visually examine the actions consequences under consideration. It's not possible to prevent all experimental forms. Even advantages are fruitful to humanity as there are a few forms of suffering which might be probable infeasible to justify.

Ethical arithmetic on animal experiments

By comparing ethical consequences of doing animal experimentation or no longer the demonstration of the consequentiality justification of animal experimentation can be carried out. The usage of such procedure cannot be done mathematically manner to avail humans determine moral questions in practice, but it does show the troubles very transparently. If appearing is very dangerous, then it's far ethically incorrect to carry out that experiment [38]. thus earlier than engaging in an animal test and for sake of animals, 3 matters should be stored under consideration, the ethical value of a person, secondly the wide variety of people who would have benefited and the last one the fee of the gain that every human being won't get [39]. however it is not so simple as it's without a doubt infeasible to assign a moral cost to a being, a cost to the harm executed to every individual. The damage with a view to be accomplished with the aid of the experiment, however the advantage is unknown the harm finished by using the experiment is due to an movement, whilst the harm as a consequence of no longer doing it's far because of an exclusion.

Certain versus potential harm

Comparison is made, by weighing two conceptually different things i.e. the animal harm versus human's loss by ceasing animal experiment [40]. The two things are different in the respect that animal harm during experiment is certain to occur if the testing is carried out. Instead of the consequence of animal experiments is unknown because it's not known how prosper the experiment would be or what profit it might generate. So it's a tedious job to draw a conclusion whether animal experiments are ethically acceptable [41].

Acts and omissions

The ethical difference present between omissions and acts does not dealt by using the equation. Ethicists cerebrate it morally worse or have opinion that we've got a moral responsibility concerning things we execute as opposed to matters we fail to do. Within the animal test context, the experimenter may damage the animals worried in experimentation but by no longer doing so the victim could be humans as they may not gain from a treatment for his or her disorder because of unavailability of the possible remedy [42].

Consequently it may be verbally expressed that it's miles morally not good for the researcher to harm the animals through experimenting, than it is to (doubtlessly) harm a few humans via not doing an experiment that might discover a treatment for their ailment. And so if we pick out to maintain with the arithmetic that we began within the above phase, we require to position a supplement, and different, aspect on every aspect of the equation to address the specific ethical values of acts and omissions.

More approaches on animal experiments

Few examples confirmed that researchers have been organized for experimentation in a way that need to no longer have been sanctioned on animals [43]. And a small number of researchers have suggested that the equal benefits may be acquired through experimenting on people in place of animals. Indeed, given that uncertainty remains because scientists should expand the packages from animal models to human beings and suppose there are properly scientific motives for preferring human subjects. If human topics had been now not involved and capable of supply loose and apprised consent to the experiment then this might now not be morally objectionable.

The main changes proposed for animal experimentations are, to compulsorily carry out ethical reviews and require sanction for animal experiments, to include categorical invertebrate species, improvements to set minimum loss along with care, to require that only second or older generations animals of be utilized, to avoid using animals from the wild and exhausting wild populations, to state that alternatives to testing on animals must be utilized, to require member states to make the breeding, and utilization of the procedures so as to eliminate or reduce to a minimum any possible pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm caused to animals [44, 45].

Additionally exclude on utilizing great apes in scientific procedures, other than in exceptional situation, but there is no proposal to phase out the expenditure of other non-human primates in the immediate future.

CONCLUSION

For testing cosmetics or harsh products on animals there is no justification today. In situation, if it is absolutely indispensable for potentially preserving a human's life then only animal experiment should be used. Alternative methods of animal experiments should be explored and

Suffering should be minimized. Number of animals should be minimised in research. The amalgamated states should at least follow the standards of the European cumulation. Researcher should be vocal that we prioritize both the best research for preserving and rejuvenating humans and value for the animal life. This is what our tradition instructs us.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are gratefully acknowledged to Amity Institute of Biotechnology, Amity University Madhya Pradesh for providing facilities during the work.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

The entire authors have contributed equally.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

There is no conflict of interest regarding publication of this review article.

REFERENCES

1. Bonventre JV, Boulware LE, Dember LM, Freedman BI, Furth SL, Holzman LB, Ketchum CJ, Little MH, Mehrotra R, Moe SM, Sands JM. (2014). The kidney research national dialogue: gearing up to move forward. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*.9(10):1806-11.
2. Ellenbroek B, Youn J. (2016). Rodent models in neuroscience research: is it a rat race?. *Disease models & mechanisms*.9(10):1079-87.
3. Justice MJ, Dhillon P. (2016). Using the mouse to model human disease: increasing validity and reproducibility. *Dis Model Mech*; 9(2): 101–103.
4. Retnam L, Chatikavanij P, Kunjara P, Paramastri YA, Goh YM, Hussein FN, Mutalib AR, Poosala S. (2016). Laws, Regulations, guidelines and standards for animal care and use for scientific purposes in the countries of Singapore, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and India. *ILAR journal.*;57(3):312-23.
5. Badyal DK, Desai C. (2014). Animal use in pharmacology education and research: The changing scenario. *Indian journal of pharmacology*.46 (3):257.

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS_NSCTLs-2021

Vol. 2, Issue I, June 2021

ISSN: 2582-3310

6. Bailey J, Balls M. (2019). Recent efforts to elucidate the scientific validity of animal-based drug tests by the pharmaceutical industry, pro-testing lobby groups, and animal welfare organisations. *BMC medical ethics.*20(1):16.
7. Mukta SK, Taur SR, m Thatte U.(2014). Establishing institutional ethics committees: Challenges and solutions—A review of the literature. *Indian journal of medical ethics.*11(3).
8. Rodger D, Blackshaw BP. (2019). Using animal-derived constituents in anaesthesia and surgery: the case for disclosing to patients. *BMC medical ethics.* 20(1):14.
9. Bayne K, Ramachandra GS, Rivera EA, Wang J. (2015). The evolution of animal welfare and the 3Rs in Brazil, China, and India. *Journal of the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science.*54(2):181-91.
10. Fontoura-Andrade JL, Amorim RF, Sousa JB. (2017). Improving reproducibility and external validity. The role of standardization and data reporting of laboratory rat husbandry and housing. *Acta cirurgica brasileira.*32(3):251-62.
11. Laviola G, Zoratto F, Ingiosi D, Carito V, Huzard D, Fiore M, Macrì S. (2017). Low empathy-like behaviour in male mice associates with impaired sociability, emotional memory, physiological stress reactivity and variations in neurobiological regulations. *PloS one.*12(12):e0188907.
12. Franco NH. (2013). Animal experiments in biomedical research: a historical perspective. *Animals.* 3(1):238-73.
13. Frasch PD. (2017). Gaps in US animal welfare law for laboratory animals: Perspectives From an animal law attorney. *ILAR journal.*57(3):285-92.
14. Verrinder JM, Ostini R, Phillips CJ. (2016). Differences in moral judgment on animal and human ethics issues between university students in animal-related, human medical and arts programs. *PloS one.* 11(3):e0149308.
15. Kirk RG. (2018). Recovering the principles of humane experimental technique: The 3Rs and the human essence of animal research. *Science, Technology, & Human Values.* 43(4):622-48.

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS_NSCTLs-2021

Vol. 2, Issue I, June 2021

ISSN: 2582-3310

16. Akhtar A. (2015). The flaws and human harms of animal experimentation. Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics. 24(4):407-19.
17. Bout HJ, Van Vlissingen JM, Karssing ED. (2014). Evaluating the ethical acceptability of animal research. *Lab animal*. 43(11):411.
18. Smith JA, Van Den Broek FA, Martorell JC, Hackbarth H, Ruksenas O, Zeller W. (2007). Principles and practice in ethical review of animal experiments across Europe: summary of the report of a FELASA working group on ethical evaluation of animal experiments. *Laboratory Animals*. 41(2):143-60.
19. Knight RB, Dvorcakova S, Luptakova L, Vdoviakova K, Petrilla V, Petrovova E. (2019). Evaluation of vasoactivity after haemotoxic snake venom administration. *Toxicon*.158:69-76.
20. Kramer M, Font E. (2017). Reducing sample size in experiments with animals: historical controls and related strategies. *Biological Reviews*.92(1):431-45.
21. Mushtaq S, Daş YK, Aksoy A. (2018). Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments. *Türkiye Klinikleri. Tip Bilimleri Dergisi*.38(2):161-70.
22. Mann SP, Sun R, Hermerén G. (2019). A framework for the ethical assessment of chimeric animal research involving human neural tissue. *BMC medical ethics*.20(1):10.
23. Andersen ML, Winter LM. (2017). Animal models in biological and biomedical research- experimental and ethical concerns. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências*. (AHEAD):0-0.
24. Ugolini GS, Cruz-Moreira D, Visone R, Redaelli A, Rasponi M. (2016).. Micro fabricated physiological models for in vitro drug screening applications. *Micromachines*. 7(12):233.
25. Franco NH. (2013). Animal experiments in biomedical research: a historical perspective. *Animals*. 3(1):238-73.
26. Shanks N, Greek R, Greek J. (2009). Are animal models predictive for humans?. *Philosophy, ethics, and humanities in medicine*. 4(1):2.

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS_NSCTLs-2021

Vol. 2, Issue I, June 2021

ISSN: 2582-3310

27. Joffe AR, Bara M, Anton N, Nobis N. (2016). The ethics of animal research: a survey of the public and scientists in North America. *BMC medical ethics.* 17(1):17.
28. Federico CA, Carlisle B, Kimmelman J, Fergusson DA. (2014). Late, never or non-existent: the inaccessibility of preclinical evidence for new drugs. *British journal of pharmacology.* 71(18):4247-54.
29. Hernandez E, Fawcett A, Brouwer E, Rau J, Turner P. (2018). Speaking up: Veterinary ethical responsibilities and animal welfare issues in everyday practice. *Animals* 8(1):15.
30. Vogt L, Reichlin TS, Nathues C, Würbel H. (2016). Authorization of animal experiments is based on confidence rather than evidence of scientific rigor. *PLoS biology.* 14(12):e2000598.
31. Van de Poel I. An ethical framework for evaluating experimental technology. *Science and engineering ethics.* 2016 ;22(3):667-86.
32. Ferdowsian HR, Gluck JP. (2015). The Ethical Challenges of Animal Research: Honoring Henry Beecher's Approach to Moral Problems. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics.* 24(4):391-406.
33. Khoo SY. (2018). Justifiability and Animal Research in Health: Can Democratisation Help Resolve Difficulties?. *Animals.*;8(2):28.
34. Baldelli I, Massaro A, Penco S, Bassi A, Patuzzo S, Ciliberti R. (2017). Conscientious objection to animal experimentation in Italian universities. *Animals.* 7(3):24.
35. Lund TB, Kondrup SV, Sandøe P. (2019). A multidimensional measure of animal ethics orientation—Developed and applied to a representative sample of the Danish public. *PloS one.* 14(2):e0211656.
36. Brønstad A, Newcomer CE, Decelle T, Everitt JI, Guillen J, Laber K. (2016). Current concepts of harm–benefit analysis of animal experiments—report from the AALAS–FELASA working group on harm–benefit analysis—part 1. *Laboratory animals.* 50(1_suppl):1-20.
37. Barré-Sinoussi F, Montagutelli X. (2015). Animal models are essential to biological research: issues and perspectives. *Future science OA.* 1(4).

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS_NSCTLs-2021

Vol. 2, Issue I, June 2021

ISSN: 2582-3310

38. Peggs K. (2015). An insufferable business: ethics, nonhuman animals and biomedical experiments. *Animals*. 5(3):624-42.
39. Das NK, Sil A. (2017). Evolution of ethics in clinical research and ethics committee. *Indian journal of dermatology*. 62(4):373.
40. Akhtar A. (2015). The flaws and human harms of animal experimentation. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics.*;24(4):407-19.
41. Cheluvappa R, Scowen P, Eri R. (2017). Ethics of animal research in human disease remediation, its institutional teaching; and alternatives to animal experimentation. *Pharmacology research & perspectives*. 5(4):e00332.
42. Gulin JE, Rocco DM, García-Bournissen F. (2015). Quality of reporting and adherence to ARRIVE guidelines in animal studies for Chagas disease preclinical drug research: a systematic review. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 9(11):e0004194.
43. Timoshanko AC, Marston H, Lidbury BA. (2017). Australian regulation of animal use in science and education: A critical appraisal. *ILAR journal*. 57(3):324-32.
44. Tannenbaum J, Bennett BT. (2015). Russell and Burch's 3Rs then and now: the need for clarity in definition and purpose. *Journal of the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science*. 54(2):120-32.
45. Smith, A.J. (2020). Guidelines for planning and conducting high-quality research and testing on animals. *Lab Anim Res*. 36, 21